



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

have done nothing, for more than a generation, to illustrate this most interesting portion of their early history? If nothing whatever of importance has appeared since, at least the fact should have been stated. In some of his references to the earlier authorities, Mr. De Costa is not accurate. Thus, on p. 12, he quotes in a note from Torfaeus the statement that Greenland was first discovered by Gunnbiorn; but a reference to the passage in the *Gronlandia Antiqua* will show that Torfaeus, in this place, is simply quoting the language of an earlier writer. So, in his Introduction, he refers to this same work of Torfaeus as throwing much light on the early voyages of the Northmen to America. Now, we venture to say, that in the whole of the *Gronlandia Antiqua* there are not, at most, more than four or five allusions to Vinland, and these are hardly more than mentions of the name. The work of Torfaeus, in which the voyages of the Northmen are so thoroughly discussed that it may be questioned whether more recent investigations have added anything of value to his treatment of the subject, is the *Historia Vinlandiæ Antiquæ*, a volume which is classed by Professor Rafn as *inter rarissimos libros*, and seems wholly to have escaped Mr. De Costa's notice. We know, however, of at least two copies of this work which are not inaccessible to the historical student. These errors are of no great consequence, but they are errors which should not be found in a work devoted to the special discussion of a chapter of Scandinavian history.

---

2. — *Étude chronologique des Livres d'Esdras et de Néhémie*. Par F. DE SAULCY, de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Paris. 1868.

M. DE SAULCY, the veteran numismatist and archæologist, has augmented the number of his monographs on Hebrew antiquities by a chronological *étude* on Ezra and Nehemiah, or, to speak more accurately, on the whole Persian period of Jewish history and a part of the following period. This elaborate, suggestive, and interesting essay, like all the other works of its distinguished author, is, as he informs us in a dedication to the Abbé Chauliac, the fruit of studies preparatory to the writing of a long-meditated history of the Maccabees. The materials from which the necessary data were to be drawn, M. de Saulcy justly complains, are in conflict "with each other, and sometimes with themselves," scanty, and rather inconclusive, the principal being: the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Haggai, and Zechariah; the Books of the Maccabees, both canonical and apocryphal; and the History of

Josephus. These he has closely studied, examining the most minute details, with the eye of independent and unprejudiced criticism. In reaching his conclusions he was controlled neither by the texts of the scriptural books, nor by the authority of Josephus, nor by the concurrent opinions of modern critics. In fact, his disregard of texts and recent authorities is striking, and borders on arbitrariness, while Josephus is both treated with contempt and followed with deference, the reason of the latter course remaining unexplained. His principal conclusions may be briefly summed up in the following table of events and dates: —

- 538, B. C. — Cyrus captures Babylon.
- 537. — He releases the Jewish captives; Sheshbazzar leads the first party of Jews returning to their country.
- 529–522. — Reign of Cambyses, designated in the Book of Ezra by the name of Artahshasta; he stops the reconstructive works of the Jews.
- 522, 521. — Gomates (Pseudo-Smerdis) reigns seven months, unmentioned in the Scriptures.
- 521. — First year of Darius Hystaspis; Zerubbabel and Jeshua lead a second party of returning Jews.
- 520. — Aided by Haggai and Zechariah, they commence building the Temple.
- 515. — The Temple is completed.
- 485. — Xerxes, the Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther, succeeds Darius.
- 465. — Artaxerxes (I.) Longimanus, unmentioned in the Scriptures, succeeds Xerxes.
- 424–404. — Reign of Darius (II.) Nothus, unmentioned in the Scriptures.
- 404. — Artaxerxes (II.) Mnemon, the Artahshast of Ezra and Nehemiah, ascends the throne.
- 397. — Ezra arrives in Jerusalem.
- 384. — Nehemiah rebuilds the walls of Jerusalem; Ezra and Eliashib assist him; Sanballat the Horonite and his associates try in vain to check the work.
- 372. — Nehemiah a second time in Jerusalem.
- 359. — Artaxerxes (III.) Ochus, unmentioned in the Scriptures, succeeds Artaxerxes II.
- 336–330. — Reign of Darius (III.) Codomannus; he appoints Sanballat the Horonite satrap of Samaria; the latter gives his daughter in marriage to Manasseh, the brother of the high-priest Jaddua; Nehemiah drives Manasseh from Jerusalem.
- 330. — Darius is overthrown by Alexander the Great; Sanballat joins the conqueror, and builds the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim.

In order the more easily to determine what in these historico-chronological statements may be regarded as more or less original with M. de Saulcy, we shall contrast with them the corresponding dates

established by Zunz and Ewald, with whom Gesenius, Munk, Hersfeld, Fürst, and almost all other recent biblical critics of note agree in all important particulars. These are:—

538. — Capture of Babylon.

536. — Cyrus allows the return of the Jews; Zerubbabel, whose court-name is Sheshbazzar, and Jeshua, the high-priest, lead the first returning column.

535. — The Samaritans check the building of the temple.

529–522. — Reign of Cambyses (the Ahasuerus of the Book of Ezra, whom M. de Saulcy passes over in silence).

522. — Pseudo-Smerdis, the Artahshashta of the Book of Ezra; beginning of the reign of Darius Hystaspis.

521. — Darius allows the rebuilding of the temple; Haggai and Zechariah co-operate with Zerubbabel.

516. — The Temple completed.

485. — Xerxes, the Ahasuerus of Esther, succeeds Darius.

465. — Artaxerxes I., the Artahshast of Ezra and Nehemiah, succeeds Xerxes.

459 (Ewald, 458 Zunz). — Ezra in Jerusalem.

445 (Ewald, 444 Zunz). — Nehemiah rebuilds the walls of Jerusalem; hostility of Sanballat and his associates.

424–404. — Reign of Darius II.; Nehemiah a second time in Jerusalem; he drives out Manasseh, grandson of the high-priest Eliashib, and son-in-law of Sanballat, who seeks refuge in Samaria; building of the Mount Gerizim temple (Zunz, later according to Ewald).

364 (Zunz, 359 Ewald). — Artaxerxes III. ascends the throne.

336–330 (Ewald, 335–330 Zunz). — Reign of Darius III.

A comparison of the two tables will show the following deviations, in M. de Saulcy's *Étude*, from the prevalent opinion, besides some chronological variations of minor importance: According to M. de Saulcy, Sheshbazzar is not identical with Zerubbabel; the former leads the first column of returning Jews; Cambyses is not identical with the Ahasuerus of Ezra (iv. 6), but with Artahshashta (Ez. iv. 7 seq.); for Smerdis there is no name in the Bible; Zerubbabel leads his followers to Judæa, not under Cyrus, but under Darius; the Artahshast of Ezra and Nehemiah is not identical with the first Artaxerxes of the Greek historians, but with the second king of that name; the Sanballat of Nehemiah is identical with the Sanballat of Josephus, a contemporary of Alexander.

To establish his points, M. de Saulcy adduces no evidence unknown to former critics. The newly deciphered inscriptions of the East are silent on these points; the well-known and long-scrutinized texts of the books mentioned above, besides some inconclusive and equally well-known

fragments of others, contain all that can serve as information. Now, with the same texts before us, we cannot refrain from stating that their internal evidence is all against the conclusions of M. de Sauley. Omitting the minor, historically unimportant discrepancies, all of which turn upon certain passages and names contained in the fourth chapter of Ezra, we must call attention to the main points, those concerning the reigns under which Zerubbabel and Nehemiah began their memorable careers. Whether Zerubbabel, "the pasha of Judæa," as Haggai calls him, and of whom Zechariah says (iv. 9), "The hands of Zerubbabel have founded this temple," is identical, or not, with Sheshbazzar, whom Cyrus "made pasha" (Ezra v. 14), and who "laid the foundations of the temple in Jerusalem" (*Ib.* 16), may possibly still be open to discussion; but to assert, as our author does, — and that on very trifling grounds, — that Zerubbabel had nothing to do with the first return to Judæa; that the twice-given list of those who "came with Zerubbabel" (Ezra ii. 2; Neh. vii. 7) refers to a different expedition than his; that the first interruption of the reconstructive works of the Jews by the Samaritans, who — as is distinctly stated — addressed themselves "to Zerubbabel" (Ezra iv. 2), and were answered by "Zerubbabel, Jeshua," etc. (*Ib.* 3), is to be explained as referring to "une action antérieure à celle à laquelle donna lieu la venue de Zeroubabel," — is simply, we think, to fly in the face of narratives as full and as distinct as any we have in Jewish history. On this point, M. de Sauley has against him also the testimony of Josephus, which he rejects the more readily, as he is not at all surprised to find "une erreur de plus de sa part, à ajouter à toutes celles que nous avons déjà tant de fois relevées." And yet it is — as far as we can discover — only the narrative of that inaccurate historian concerning Sanballat and his connection with Darius III., Alexander, and Jaddua, that causes M. de Sauley to place the career of Ezra in the time of Artaxerxes II., and to make Nehemiah a contemporary of the Macedonian conqueror. In order to do this, it is, however, necessary to make both Nehemiah and Sanballat figure at the head of hostile camps at two periods fifty years apart, and to leave a blank in the history of the Jews of Palestine extending from about B. C. 515 to B. C. 397. This is, of course, not a fatal, though certainly a serious objection to the proposed change in the chronology of the age of Ezra and Nehemiah; but what makes that change decidedly unacceptable — as long as we entertain the slightest regard for biblical texts — is the connection repeatedly mentioned of Nehemiah with the high-priest Eliashib, who, according to our author's own showing, can be computed to have flourished in the time of Artaxerxes I., full one hundred years before Alexander

and the equally distinct mention (Neh. xii. 26) of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Joiakim, the father of Eliashib, as contemporaries. In the face of all these difficulties, M. de Sauley does not hesitate to follow the lead of Josephus, — whose books, as he acknowledges, swarm with anachronisms, — and we must consider it as ironical when he says, speaking of Eliashib: “*Nous nous inclinons d'ailleurs devant le texte biblique.*” We, on our part, profess no undue reverence for texts, but we would sacrifice none that are intrinsically credible, in order to save the credit of a narrative of Josephus.

The most valuable contribution to archæological discovery contained in the monograph before us is, we believe, the digression, at its close, concerning the age of the ruins of Arak-el-Emir, or Kasr-el-Aabed, which bear in two inscriptions, lately deciphered by Dr. Levy of Breslau, the name of Tobiah, who appears to be the Ammonite *ebed* of that name, — the associate of Sanballat, — and the history of whose descendants M. de Sauley traces in an ingenious way. But want of space compels us to refer our readers to the little book itself.

- 
3. — *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago.* By ALFRED S. BICKMORE, M. A., etc. New York: D: Appleton & Co. 1869. 8vo. pp. 553.

NEXT to the pleasure of visiting foreign countries, and especially those but little known, is the enjoyment of the traveller in telling his adventures; but the small company of travellers who give as much pleasure to their listeners as to themselves does not increase rapidly in these days of easy transit. Now, more than ever, is it necessary to prepare for a scientific journey by careful study and faithful training, if the result is to be of real value. It is so easy to visit regions once almost inaccessible, that many of our travelling countrymen, aiming at a reputation once purchased only by patient, brave, self-sacrificing, intelligent work, imagine themselves called upon to be Humboldt's successors, and for a time enjoy a cheaply purchased honor.

A private exploring expedition is usually far more successful than the cumbrous armies or navies governments commonly send out, and the greater part of the known species, both of plants and animals, have been discovered through the enterprise of expeditions consisting of one or two devoted students of nature, who have gone forth to new fields, as did the disciples of Linnæus, not for pecuniary advantage or for fame, but with the single purpose of advancing science. Knowing the advantages of individual labor in the world-wide field of geographical